



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EROTIC TEACHING IN ROMAN ELEGY AND THE GREEK SOURCES. PART I

BY ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

The erotic teaching which pervades much of the work of Tibullus and Propertius and culminates in the *Ars amatoria* of Ovid is one of the most striking and characteristic features of Roman elegy. All three elegists assume the rôle of erotic expert and all three give utterance to numerous erotic precepts. Erotic teaching is, therefore, of importance to all who would understand the nature of Roman elegy. But it possesses another interest. It is part of that subjective-erotic note which is recognized as the great and distinguishing characteristic of the genre, and the study of its sources should throw light upon the origin of the subjective-erotic type of elegy.

Was subjective-erotic elegy, the first extant examples of which appear among the Romans, developed by the Alexandrian elegists? This is the most important of all the questions which concern the relation of the Roman elegists to their Greek sources. The solution, which can be only approximate because of the almost complete loss of Alexandrian elegy, depends broadly upon the interpretation of two groups of facts. The first and more obvious of these consists of the references to Greek literature—especially to Callimachus and Philetas—in Roman elegy and the meager *testimonia* of Diomedes, etc; the second comprises the numerous passages in various genres of Greek literature which parallel, often very closely, the characters, motives, and situations common in Roman elegy. The evidence derived from the first group has hitherto proved utterly inadequate to solve the problem. The statements of Propertius, Ovid (Tibullus never alludes to his sources), and Diomedes are so vaguely general and susceptible of so many interpretations that they have been made to prove both sides of the question.¹ The general acknowledgment

¹Cf. e.g. F. Jacoby *Rh.M.* LX (1905), 38-105, the best argument that there was no subjective-erotic elegy at Alexandria, and Th. Gollnisch, *Quaestiones elegiacae*, Vratislaviae, 1905, the most careful champion of the opposite view. The conclusions of Jacoby, whose article is excellent and very thorough, are accepted by E. Norden in his recent sketch of Roman literature, *Einleit. in die Altertumswiss.* (Leipzig, 1910) I, 506, 567.

of Propertius, for example, that his chief models were Callimachus and Philetas—that he was the “Roman Callimachus” (iv. 1, 64)—proves neither that he adapted every characteristic feature of their elegies nor that they had all the essential features of Propertian elegy. In short, these statements of the Romans can be made to fit either view, and no conclusions should be based upon them until a thorough study, or rather a series of studies, has been devoted to the second group of facts—the parallel passages. In these and in the solution of the questions connected with them, lies our hope of solving the main problem.

The Greek parallels, which have been enormously multiplied by the work of the last fifteen years, have so widely extended our knowledge of the pervasiveness of the Greek influence that even Tibullus, who used to be thought so “Roman,” is now known to be not less under its spell than Propertius and Ovid. These parallels, appearing at widely different periods and in many different genres, have made it necessary to engage in a source-study in Greek literature before we can point with any degree of certainty to the immediate source of any detail of Roman elegy. If in a given case the fact of influence has been demonstrated and the earliest, i.e., the ultimate, Greek source has been pointed out, the most difficult question still remains: By what channel did the Greek influence reach Roman elegy? The favorite method of dealing with this question seems to me so one-sided that I wish to make some criticisms, to emphasize some factors in the problem which have been distorted or overlooked, and to illustrate my point of view by a study of the erotodidactic element.

A brief outline of the current method of investigation in this field must precede any criticisms that I have to offer. This outline naturally begins with Friedrich Leo's very interesting treatment of comedy and elegy (*Plaut. Forsch.* [1895] 126–41), for that treatment has been at once the stimulus and the guide of almost all the later work on the sources of elegy. In addition, it intimately concerns the erotodidactic element, which is the main subject of the present paper. If I venture to differ in part with his interpretation of the facts, I do so with diffidence and with the unqualified acknowledgment that to him more than to anybody else is due the great advance which has been made in this field of investigation. With this pref-

ace, I may outline Leo's views as follows: The many agreements between Roman elegy and Roman comedy indicate that Greek new comedy is the ultimate source of the comic motives in Roman elegy, for the Augustan elegists did not read Plautus and Terence. But the Roman elegists did not use the *νέα* directly, as the older scholars (Huschke, etc.) thought; rather the influence came indirectly through the medium of the Alexandrian poets, especially the elegists, whom Propertius and Ovid acknowledge as their models. The Alexandrians had already taken over the motives of comedy, each poet modifying them from personal experience and from life. The same material of comedy appears in Lucian and Alciphron, who used comedy directly, and in Aristaenetus and Philostratus, who did not know comedy directly, but drew on Lucian and Alciphron or on Alexandrian elegy.¹ In single cases the Roman elegists may have been influenced directly by the *νέα*, for they knew the plays, but the indirect relation is the only natural one and is indicated by the diffusion of these motives in Greek and Roman erotic literature and by the close connection between Greek and Roman elegy as shown by the erotic epigram.

Without pausing here to criticize Leo's views in detail, let us see how they have been narrowed into a veritable creed in the work of his followers. Leo did not entirely close the door of direct influence; his followers have closed it tight. They have reduced the matter to an equation; Agreements between Roman elegy and any other literature = Alexandrian elegy as the immediate source. Alexandrian elegy thus becomes the clearing-house for all Greek influence on Roman elegy. I can illustrate this in striking fashion by means of a passage from V. Hoelzer's dissertation (Marpurgi Cattorum, 1899), which has the significant title, *De poesi amatoria a comicis Atticis exculpta, ab elegiacis imitatione expressa. Pars prior*. After pointing out the seven passages of Propertius and Ovid in which Menander's work, especially the *Thais*, is mentioned and disallowing direct influence of the *νέα* because Propertius and Ovid acknowledge Callimachus and Philetas as direct models and because Diomedes (i. 484k.) says that Tibullus followed Callimachus and Euphorion, he adds (p. 7),

¹Leo refers to Reich *De Alciphronis Longique aetate*, Königsberg, 1894.

Quibus de causis Tibullum, Propertium, Ovidium neque ex Atticorum neque ex Romanorum comoediis recta via hausisse puto, sed consensio illa mihi ita explicanda videtur, ut ex comoediis Atticis res amatoriae in elegos Alexandrinos . . . et ex iis deinceps in elegos Romanorum fluxerint. Qua in opinione nobis, quod Alexandrinorum carmina iniquitate temporum perierunt, acquiescendum esset, nisi a viris doctis demonstratum esset anthologiae Palatinae poetas plurimos, deinde Nonnum, Musaeum, tum Aristaenetum, Philostratum, denique eroticos, quos dicimus, scriptores saepe Alexandrinorum vestigia pressisse . . . itaque si magnam partem rerum amatoriarum quibus Tibullus, Propertius, Ovidius cum Plauto et Terentio et comicorum Atticorum fragmentis consentiunt, etiam apud imitatores illos Alexandrinorum reperimus, aut certo aut non sine magna veritatis specie affirmare possumus eas ex comoediis Atticis ab elegiacis Alexandrinorum poetis desumptas, tum denique imitatoribus Romanis traditas esse.¹

But there have been indications of a partial reaction against Leo's method in its extreme form. The Breslau dissertation of Th. Gollnisch, *Quaestiones elegiacae* (1905), is the best instance of this. It is true that Gollnisch goes to extremes not only in asserting that subjective-erotic elegy existed at Alexandria, but even in tracing single Roman elegies to single Alexandrian models—an attempt which seems far from successful. On the other hand he seems unquestionably right in his assertion and in much of his proof that the Romans received suggestions directly from epigram, comedy, and mythological elegy as well as from the entirely hypothetical Alexandrian elegy.²

¹The *virī docti* to whom Hoelzer refers are Birt *Elpides* (on *Spēs*, Tib. ii. 6, 19 ff.; Ovid *Ex Pont.* i. 6, 27 ff.); Belling *Albius Tibullus* (1897); Maass *Hermes* XVIII, 321 ff. and XXIV, 526 ff.; Mallet *Quaestt. Propert.* (1882), p. 2; Dilthey *Cydidippe* (1863); Leo *Pl. F.* 128; Rohde *Griech. Roman* 145 ff. It is aside from my purpose to criticize these "proofs" in detail, especially since none of them concern erotodidaxis, but it may be said that even when there is probability that a given motif comes from Alexandrian elegy, it is unsafe to reason by analogy from this to other motives of a different type. Aristaenetus, for example, probably got his account of Cydidippe (Ep. x) from Alexandrian elegy, and by analogy he is supposed to have got everything else from the same source! As a matter of fact Ep. x, to say nothing of its mythological content, is twice the length of any other letter (except i. 13) and is peculiar in the development of the thought. With equal justice one might assert that Aristaenetus, who at times practically transcribed Lucian, drew all of his material from Lucian—if Lucian were only lost! In the same way Rohde's proof that in the *erotici* many of the commonplaces of erotic narrative—the meeting of the lovers, love at first sight, the effects of passion on body and mind, etc.—were in Alexandrian elegy is conclusive enough (*Gr. Rom.*² 154 ff.). But Rohde gives express warning (p. 172) that in passages reflecting real life, not the heroic age, the elegists were not the sources of the *erotici*.

²Cf. also F. Jacoby *Rh. M.* LX (1905), 82, and P. Legrand *Rev. des ét. grecq.* XX (1907), 184.

With regard to comedy, which is of first importance in a study of erotic teaching, he makes direct influence probable by showing that in several cases the Roman elegists who use comic motives agree more closely with comedy itself than with any extant elegiac treatment. Thus Ovid *A. i. 8* (*lenae praecepta*) agrees closely with Plautus *Most. i. 3* (Scapha's precepts to Philematium) and not with Propertius *iv. 5*, which Ovid must also have known.¹ Ovid was reverting to the original source, the *νέα*, although he had predecessors among his Roman contemporaries, and it is probable that Ovid's agreements with Tibullus and Propertius are often due to the common sources of all three elegists rather than to imitation of his two older contemporaries.

The foregoing outline, brief as it is, indicates that it is unsafe to infer from the probable sources of one elegy that the sources of others were the same or even to reason by analogy from one part of the same elegy to another.² If we are certain of anything concerning Alexandrian elegy it is that mythology played a prominent part in the genre, and it is probable that Ovid drew his version of the Cydippe story from that source. But in *Am. i. 7* and *8*, which reflect life, Ovid turned to comedy, the mirror of life. The *ars amatoria* (τέχνη ἐρωτική) which is so prominent in Roman elegy is also a reflection of real life and was not applicable to the heroic age. The τέχνη ἐρωτική was developed in comedy, and comedy is therefore the ultimate source of this element, including erotic teaching, in Roman elegy. This is the general truth, but as has been shown, the channel by which comedy exerted this influence on Roman elegy is by no means determined. Facts we have in abundance; explanations of the facts differ. It is not, therefore, primarily my purpose to add new parallels, although I have been able to do this in some instances, but rather I shall try to follow the didactic thread as it appears in the mass of varying parallels already collected³ and to

¹ Similar results are obtained for *Ov. A. i. 7*; cf. Menander's *Περικύρ.* and Philostratus *Epp. 16* (26), 61 (64); for *Tib. i. 3*, 83-92, cf. Terence *Haut. 274-95*, 302-7 and *Alciphron ii. 4*; and for Propertius *iii. 6. 1-8*, cf. Terence *Haut. 291 f.*, 302-3, 285-95.

² This is especially dangerous in Tibullus, each of whose elegies is usually compounded of a number of motives.

³ I have already referred to Leo *Plaut. Forsch.* 126-41; Gollnisch *Quaest. elegiacae*; Hoelzer *De poesi amat.*; F. Jacoby *Rh. M. LX* (1905), 38-105; P. Legrand *Rev. d. ét. gr. XX* (1907), 176-231; cf. *ibid.* *XXI* (1908), 37-79. Add to these Leo *G.G.A.* 1898 (I),

bring out new aspects of these parallels. Such a study, enforced by some general considerations, will result, I hope, in a more convincing explanation of the facts.

In order to trace the course of this Greek influence those erotic motives must be studied in which the didactic tone is clear and for which a sufficient number of Greek parallels exist. The study must center in Propertius and Tibullus, and Ovid will be used chiefly by way of supplement and illustration, since it is often possible that he is drawing, not on Greek literature, but on his Roman predecessors. It will be convenient to arrange the material according to the system adopted in my article on "Propertius as Praeceptor Amoris":¹ (1) those passages in which the rôle of erotic expert appears; (2) those which contain erotic precepts in detail. The two groups are often identical, of course, but important results will be obtained by a study of the rôle first. The rôle of erotic expert (*peritus*) appears clearly in Tibullus and Propertius as well as in Ovid's *Ars amatoria*; cf. *Class. Phil.* V, 28-40. In the Greek the following passages are most significant:

Lucian,² *Dialog. meretr.* iii and vii (the old mother-*lena* rebuking and instructing her daughter), viii (an older *meretrix* discoursing on the signs of true passion); cf. also vi. These are virtually scenes from comedy.

Aristaenetus³ Ep. i. 4. One youth (*peritus*) addresses another (*rudis*), σὺ δὲ τούτων ἄπειρος (*rudis*) ἔτι· ἀλλ' ἔπον καὶ μάθανε, καὶ συναπόλασον ἐρωτικῇ διδασκάλῳ (*praeceptor amoris*)· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μάθημα παρ' ὄντινόν ποιῶμαι δεινότατος (*peritissimus*!) εἶναι. The whole letter is in point.

Aristaenetus Ep. i. 14. A *meretrix* writes to a youth that money alone will influence her; she has been too well taught to be wheedled by

47 ff.; (II) 722 ff., and *Rh. M.* LV (1900), 604 ff.; F. Wilhelm *Satura Viadrina* (1896) 48 ff.; *Philologus* LX (1901), 579-92; *Rh. M.* LVII (1902), 57-75, 599 ff.; LIX (1904), 279 ff.; R. Buerger *De Ovidii carminum amat. inventione et arte*, Guelferbyti (1901). These investigations have proved most useful for my purpose and I make free use of their results and materials. Other references will be added at the proper places.

¹ *Class. Phil.* V (1910), 28-40.

² Edited by C. Jacobitz, III, Teubner text (1881). The close connection between the *Dialogi meretr.* and the *rea* is evident to any reader and has been excellently worked out in detail by P. Legrand, *op. cit.*, who starts with the explicit testimony of the scholiast (p. 275 ed. Rabe, 1906).

³ Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci*, Parisiis, 1873; cf. Hoelzer *op. cit.* 78 ff. Aristaenetus certainly used Lucian in many passages. Cf. Legrand *op. cit.* 181 and Alexandrian elegy (see above, p. 443). Whether he used comedy directly is the point at issue. No direct proofs to the contrary have been offered. Cf. especially Gollnisch, 60-70.

music, etc.; her teacher has been her experienced sister: ὤθητε δέ με ῥαδίως ἐξαπατᾶν ὡς ἐρωτικῶν ἀγύμναστον παῖδα καὶ παντελῶς ἀμύητον Ἀφροδίτης . . . ἀλλ' ἔγωγε παλαιᾷ συνοῦσα πορνοδιδασκάλῃ τῇ ἀδελφῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνης ἐρασταῖς κατὰ πρόφασιν ὁμιλοῦσα οὐδὲν ἔδοξα δυσμαθῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐταιρικὸν ἤδη μεμελέτηκα βίον, etc.

Longus¹ *Praefat.* 3-4 (describing his work) . . . τέτταρας βίβλους ἐξεπονησάμην, ἀνάθημα μὲν Ἑρωτι καὶ Νύμφαις καὶ Πανί, κτῆμα δὲ τερπνὸν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃ καὶ νοσοῦντα ἰάσεται, καὶ λυπούμενον παραμυθήσεται, τὸν ἐρασθέντα ἀναμνήσει, τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα προπαιδεύσει. This is the attitude assumed by Ovid in the *Ars amatoria*, by Tibullus i. 6, etc., and by Propertius in ii. 34, etc.; cf. *Class. Phil.* V (1910), 30 ff.

Moschus² vi. 7-8 (*ap. Stobaeum*, 63, 29), a bucolic epigram,

ταῦτα λέγω πᾶσιν τὰ διδάγματα τοῖς ἀνεράστοις·

στέργετε τοὺς φιλέοντας, ἵν' ἡνφιλήτε, φιλήσθε.

Longus³ ii. 6-7 (an old man, Philetas, instructs the young Daphnis and Chloe on the nature, the attributes, and the effect of Cupid). The passage is too long to quote, but the opening words (c. 7)—after Philetas has told them that they are in Cupid's care—indicate the content: . . . ἐπυνθάνοντο τί ἐστί ποτε ὃ Ἑρως, πότερα παῖς ἢ ὄρνις, καὶ τί δύναται. For the instructive nature of the discourse cf. c. 8, 1: Φιλητᾶς μὲν τοσαῦτα παιδεύσας αὐτοὺς ἀπαλλάττεται.

Achilles Tatius⁴ i. 9-11. Clinias, a youth who is *peritus*, instructs the recently smitten Clitipho, who is, therefore, *rudis*. The remarks of Clinias are rich in erotic *sententiae* and *praecepta*, but it is sufficient here to cite some phrases which indicate the rôle of teacher: Clinias 9, 7: Ἐν οὖν σοι παραιῶ μόνον, etc.; Clitipho, *ibid.*, δός μοι ἀφορμὰς· σὺ γὰρ ἀρχαιότερος μύστης ἐμοῦ καὶ συνηθέστερος ἤδη τῇ τελετῇ τοῦ θεοῦ· τί λέγω; τι ποιῶ; πῶς τύχοιμι τῆς ἐρωμένης; Οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ τὰς ὁδοὺς. Although Clinias rejoins that love is ἀντοδιδάκτος (10, 1), he proceeds to give some general principles: Ὅσα δ' ἐστὶ κοινὰ καὶ μὴ τῆς εὐκαίρου τύχης δεόμενα, ταῦτα ἀκούσας μάθε.

In the foregoing passages the rôle of erotic teacher is assigned to the *lena* and the *meretrix*, to the old man and the youth—in all cases

¹ Hercher's text, Lipsiae, 1858. I do not find this passage cited elsewhere.

² Passage in Wilhelm *Sat. Viad.* 58.

³ Hoelzer, *op. cit.* 78, refers to this passage without citation. Longus may have drawn his comic material from Alciphron, who certainly imitated comedy directly; cf. C. Bonner *Class. Phil.* IV (1909), 32-44, 276-90, especially p. 290, who argues against Reich *De Alciphronis Longique aetate*, Königsberg, 1894. But Longus may also have used comedy directly, as Bonner himself admits. No direct proof to the contrary has been offered.

⁴ Hercher's text, Lipsiae, 1858. For the relation of the *erotici* to comedy cf. Rohde's remark p. 443 (above). This passage is referred to without citation by Hoelzer *op. cit.* 78.

to one who is *peritus* (or *perita*). Only twice (Longus *Praefat.* 3-4 and Moschus vi, 7-8) is the rôle assumed by the poet or author. There are thus two forms in which the rôle appears: 1st, assigned to a character, generally a *lena* or *meretrix*; 2nd, assumed by the author. In Roman elegy both forms appear, but the relative frequency is reversed: the leading *praeceptor* is the poet himself, whereas a character appears in the rôle of *praeceptor* much less frequently. This change is due to difference of genre. In elegy, erotic teaching is connected with the subjective attitude—the poet's personal experience and feeling. The poet is, therefore, naturally the *praeceptor*. The same is natural enough in epigram; cf. Moschus. But in the erotic epistles and romances it was hardly possible for the author, recounting the experiences of his characters, to assume this rôle—except in a preface like that of Longus, which closely corresponds to the program poems of Propertius (ii. 34 etc.).¹ In Roman elegy, therefore, we have: first, the transfer, essentially unaltered, of the rôle as assigned to the *lena*,² cf. Prop. iv. 5, Tib. i. 5, 47 ff.; i. 6, 67 ff.; Ovid *Am.* i. 8; second, the rôle of poet-*praeceptor*, cf. Prop. i. 7 and 9; ii. 34 etc.; Tib. i. 4, 75, i. 6, 9 ff.; Ovid, *Am.* ii. 18, 20; *A.A.* i. 1 ff.; ii, 12, etc. Now, the ultimate source of erotic teaching is Greek comedy, especially the *véa*. This is shown by the many close parallels to be found in Plautus and Terence. It is unnecessary to print these passages here, for many of them will be sufficiently outlined later,³ and it is

¹Cf. *Class. Phil.* V.

²I shall have occasion in several places to refer to this transfer of essentially unchanged material of comedy, and whoever reads Propertius iv. 5 will, I think, grant that when applied to the figure and remarks of the *lena* in that elegy (or others quoted) the term is correct. I am careful to make this clear because Leo in his brilliant little rejoinder to Rothstein (*Rh.M.* LV [1900], 609) says, "der Elegiker übernimmt die Motive der Komödie nicht als Rohstoff, sondern er gleicht sie dem Stil seiner Gattung an und es kann unter seiner Hand, zumal unter der eines Dichters wie Properz, mag er auch manche ausgeprägte Münzen weitergeben, immer wieder das äusserliche Motiv zum innerlichen, das grobe zum zarten, etc. . . . das nur der Handlung dienende zum Erreger von Herz und Sprache werden." This is well put and in general correct, but to me the passages I have cited and others still to come are as nearly a transfer of the *Rohstoff* of comedy as the differences between the two genres admit.

³For the *meretrix* as teacher, cf. Plautus *Bacch.* 163-65 (the pupil is a *rudis adulescens*); *Truc.* 132, 735 ff.; Terence *Hec.* 203 ff.; for the *lena* as teacher, cf. Pl. *As.* i. 3, especially 177 ff., 215 ff. (ironical revelations of *praecepta* to an *adulescens*), 504 ff. (to a *meretrix*); *Cist.* 38 ff., 78-81 (to a *meretrix*); Terence *Eun.* 233 ff.; the older *meretrix* instructing a younger, *Most.* i. 3, especially 171, 186, 246, 265-78; *Poen.*

enough to say that in comedy the rôle of erotic teacher is often assigned to a *lena*, *meretrix*, or even an *adulescens*. When, therefore, in elegy this rôle is transferred bodily, as in Prop. iv, 5 or Ovid A. 1. 8, in both of which *lenae praecepta* are given at length and cursed by the poet,¹ and this transfer of the rôle is compared with the more numerous and more truly elegiac passages in which the poet is the erotic teacher, the relative age of the two forms appears. The first—the character as teacher—is the original form; the second—the poet as teacher—has developed out of the first because only by such a change could the rôle become essentially elegiac. The poet takes the place of the *lena* or *meretrix* or *peritus adulescens* of comedy, and becomes an erotic expert himself. He has the same pupils—other youths, occasionally a *senex*,² even the *meretrix* herself. He turns the *praecepta meretricum* against the sex, as we shall see, or professes to have discovered new principles. He claims, at least partially or in unguarded moments, to have acquired his knowledge from experience,³ just as most of his predecessors in comedy had acquired theirs. All this is clear. But although the fact of this development cannot be doubted, the par-

216, 233-329; the *peritus adulescens* instructing a friend, *Tri.* 665-78, etc. Legrand, *op. cit.*, remarks that the fragments of the *πῆα* give hardly any aid; cf. 258 K (Menander). He notes that Philostr. xvi mentions Menander, and adds Turpilius frag. I (*Demiurgus*).

¹The arts of the *lena*, etc., are, of course, often opposed to the interests of the lover. *Hinc imprecationes!* Tibullus is no less emphatic (i. 5, 47 ff.; ii. 6, 44 ff.).

²Lynceus, the poet-philosopher, whom Propertius instructs (ii. 34), is probably a reflex of the philosopher ridiculed by comedy. The attitude of comedy toward philosophers and their tenets is discussed by M. Helm *Lukian und Menipp* 371 ff.; cf. Legrand *op. cit.* 213 ff., who compares especially Lucian *Dial. meretr.* x (Drosis abuses *ὁ κακίστα φιλοσόφων ἀπολούμενος Ἀρισταίβερος* because he has detained her Kleinias and because he does not practice what he preaches). Legrand does not notice the appearance of this figure in elegy. Ponticus (Prop. i. 7 and 9) is similar. In Alciphron i. 34, 7 Thais tells Ethydemus, who has turned to philosophy, that *amicae* are not worse instructors of youth than the sophists, e.g., Pericles was a pupil of Aspasia, Critias of Socrates!

³Such phrases as "Cynthia me docuit" (Prop. i. 10, 19), "Ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit" (*ibid.* ii. 1, 4), "rudes animos . . . imbuit Lycinna" (*ibid.* iii. 15, 3) are hardly to be compared with the passages of comedy, etc., in which the *meretrix* teaches the youth (Hoelzer *op. cit.* 78), but are merely poetic fiction for experience; cf. *Class. Phil.* V (1910), 39. In the same way the elegist often attributes his erotic knowledge to a god, i.e. to his inspiration; cf. Tib. i. 4 (Priapus, probably influenced by bucolic poetry, which is so important in Tibullus), i. 8 (Venus), Prop. iii. 3, 49 (Calliope), Ovid A.A. ii. 493 (Apollo), etc.

ticular period in which elegy adapted to its own uses the rôle of erotic teacher is not so clear. Had the Alexandrian elegists already made this adaptation, or did the Romans make it themselves directly from comedy? The second alternative seems to me more probable. As negative arguments it may be urged that epigram, with the single exception of Moschus VI, is silent concerning the rôle of erotic teacher. The adaptation was certainly not made in epigram, or at least not developed; and even if it were, epigram owes as much to comedy as to Alexandrian elegy.¹ Moreover the silence of epigram not only removes one possible source of the didactic element in Roman elegy, which owes much to epigram, but also takes away an important factor in the reconstruction of Alexandrian elegy. Again, if the rôle of erotic teacher was as common in Alexandrian elegy as its frequency in Roman elegy would lead those to believe who accept the theory of its derivation from that source, it is strange that (except Longus *Praefat.* 3-4) no reflex of the typically elegiac form—the author- or poet-teacher—has been discovered in the later Greek literature. The Roman elegists have both forms; the late Greeks, who imitated both comedy and Alexandrian elegy, but not Roman elegy, have abundant traces of the comic form only. These facts become intelligible if we assign the transfer of the comic form, the teaching *lena*, to both the late Greeks and the Roman elegists working independently,² and the development of the genuine elegiac form to the Romans.

On the positive side stands the existence of two forms of the rôle in Roman elegy—the one taken bodily from comedy, and undeveloped, though applied to elegiac purposes and set in an elegiac frame, the other a form which could hardly have occurred in comedy at all. This seems to indicate development within the limits of elegy. The first step—transfer of the teaching *lena* directly from comedy—has been proved by Gollnisch *op. cit.* 19-21, for Ovid *Am.* i. 8.³ Not only are there many agreements in detail between this elegy and

¹The same reasoning applies to bucolic poetry, if one prefers to emphasize the bucolic content rather than the epigrammatic form and development of Mosch. VI.

²By this I do not mean that each of the late Greeks worked independently nor that each Roman—especially Ovid—was always independent, but that each *group*, Roman and Greek, was independent of Alexandrian elegy.

³Referred to above, p. 444.

the famous toilet scene of the *Mostellaria* (i. 3), cf. Ovid i. 8, 39–40 with *Most.* 188–90; Ovid. 109–14 with *Most.* 292–93, 203, 192–93, etc., but also the situation is strikingly similar. In the *Mostellaria* Philolaches plays the part of eavesdropper throughout the larger part of the scene, now lauding, now threatening the old *meretrix* Scapha, according as her remarks to Philematium favor or oppose his own interests. Ovid plays the same part and takes the same attitude toward the *lena*. If then Ovid, the least independent of the Roman elegists and the one most likely to use both Alexandrian elegy and his Roman predecessors, drew this motif directly from comedy, substituting himself for the *adulescens* of the play,¹ it becomes more probable that teaching by a *lena* and other erotic teaching in Roman elegy needs no intermediary Alexandrian elegy to explain its existence.²

BYRN MAWR COLLEGE

¹These agreements with the *Most.* do not prove, of course, that Ovid used the Greek original of that play (Philemon's *Φάσμα*?). Doubtless the situation occurred more than once in the *vêa*.

²Gollnisch (*op. cit.* 20) accepts Hoelzer's assertion (*op. cit.* 81–82) that Prop. iv. 5 (*lena*-teacher) is derived from some Alexandrian poet who had used comedy. With Hoelzer's proof I cannot agree. It rests upon the resemblance between Prop. iv. 5 and Aristaenetus *Ep.* i. 14 (partly cited above, p. 445–6)—especially on the quotation in iv. 5, 55–56: *Quid iuvat ornato*, etc.: i. 2. 1–2, and the similar quotation in Aristaenetus, *οὐκ ἐπιθυμῆς, ὃ πάρθενε, γενέσθαι γυνή;* Both quotations are used as instances of a typical *blanditia* employed by lovers and detected by the *meretrix*. In both passages the old principle of the *lena* or *meretrix* that songs are of no avail—"money talks"—is used. The ultimate source of both is clearly comedy, and Alexandrian elegy cannot be interposed unless it can be proved on some other evidence than Roman elegy that Aristaenetus did not draw on comedy directly or on Lucian for this motif.